assistance in the traditional sense. People will call directory assistance for a couple of reasons; one, they do not have a directory, or they -- the directory they have does not have the listing that they're seeking, perhaps a new resident, or just don't want to go get it.

2 11

You know, they might just choose that it's easier to go ahead and call directory assistance and get the information; and I think the same thing is true in electronic format. CD ROM placed in a computer would be roughly the equivalent of a paper telephone directory, which you could look up your own listing if -- however, if you can't find the CD, it's scratched, for some reason it doesn't work, and you can still get into your computer, you can go in and look up the Internet service. It's there whenever you want it and whether or not you have a directory at your disposal. To me, that's the difference.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Say that again. The difference is if you have -- between the CD ROM and the print directory, having the Internet access, how is -- I guess you were saying it was more like directory assistance.

WITNESS JUNEAU: It's a look-up service.

You know, it's similar to directory assistance. You

call directory assistance for a specific listing for whatever reason that you don't have it by way of a directory. Whether you choose to use it or do not have a directory it's an alternative that provides you the number in the absence of that directory.

The Internet is essentially the same thing.

It's just not tended by an individual. You just do
your own search, but it's a look-up that you can
configure yourself without the benefit of the
directory. And in the absence of any directory in
hand, any paper directory, any CD ROM, any other type
of directory, you can go into the Internet and look up
a directory listing. It's identical, in our opinion,
to directory assistance that BellSouth provides.

what you're saying is the difference is it's in a remote location and you have to go outside your living room where you might have your phone book or your computer, and you have to go seek the information from an off-premises source.

witness Juneau: Well, Commissioner, that, in one regard that's true. It's an alternative to using a physical directory.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: So is a CD ROM.
WITNESS JUNEAU: And a CD ROM is an

alternative to the paper directory, but it basically provides you the same thing. It's a complete list of all the directory -- all the directory listings, and you can use your keyboard and your computer to look just as you would flip through the pages of a paper directory.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Which is the same thing you would do on the Internet.

witness juneau: But there is -- to me, the difference there is that in the absence of any directory, you can still go into the Internet. If you have no CD ROM directory and you have no paper directory but you do have your computer linked to the Internet, you have directory assistance service. You can look up an individual listing right there without the benefit of any directory being available.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Okay. That's interesting, because in the absence of the computer -- I'm having a problem with that logic. In the absence of the printed directory, certainly you can't look up the numbers if that's the only source you have, but in the absence of having Internet, you can't look it up either.

The distinction that Commissioner Clark made was the only distinction that I could follow

completely and understand.

witness juneau: But, Chairman, and to back into that description too, in the absence of a printed directory, in the absence of a CD ROM and no link to the Internet, but if you have your telephone, you can go back to directory assistance. It seems to me to be an equivalent service to what you can get on the Internet. It's used pretty much the same way. A person who goes --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Isn't a CD ROM used exactly the same way?

witness Juneau: Yes, Commissioner, it could be used the same way. The difference is, though, again, just like a paper directory, if you can't find it or for some reason it was out of date, potentially the Internet is going to stay updated and be more current. A CD ROM is dated. It becomes obsolete or begins to obsolete at the point it's --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Isn't that pretty much what your argument -- isn't that precisely what the companies want is to have their service be able to be updated, their directory to be updated, and isn't that the problem?

I mean, forget the Internet. You say that the Internet, except for the advantage that you just

placed on the Internet comparing it to directory
assistance, meaning that it's up-to-date information,
that's precisely what the complainants here want is
up-to-date information, isn't it?

purpose is to publish -- that's true, what they want.

They want up-to-date information, but I've heard it stated for a different purpose. The purpose was have up-to-date information for the delivery of directories and to sell Yellow Pages advertising, but not to provide directory assistance service.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Which is one of the things that you'd like is definitely not to have directory assistance, for them to provide that; correct?

WITNESS JUNEAU: Not under the DPDS tariff.
Under the DADS tariff --

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Right.

witness juneau: -- we would be willing to sell to anyone, yes.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: In your mind, why is it appropriate to have two separate tariffs for providing the same information?

WITNESS JUNEAU: Commissioner, the reason is that they -- the value of that information as it's

used is different. The directory assistance, because of its value to the customer, creates a value to the directory assistance provider. The directory, the published directory, has a different value in our estimation.

commissioner clark: Let me ask you one follow-up question. Why is it appropriate to price this based on market as opposed to cost plus a reasonable contribution? Why is this particular service appropriately priced that way as opposed to the cost?

WITNESS JUNEAU: Which one are you speaking of?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Why is it appropriate to tariff both DPDS and DADS at a market price as opposed to cost plus a reasonable contribution? And I would define that as being 12%.

witness Juneau: I think I'm giving you the same answer and I don't want to seem like I'm evading it. But it's based on the value that that service has to the user, and it's not just the directory provider, but it's to the end user of the directory itself for the directory assistance service itself. And in setting the market rate, you know, again we thought coming into this that we had set a very, very low

market rate.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Let me ask it differently. Maybe that's what the confusion is.

There are some services that under our Telecommunications Act, meaning the state Telecommunications Act, and the Federal Telecommunications Act that tell you how you can price various services, and some of those services are TELRIC or TSLRIC, but as I understand it, the notion of the TELRIC is marginal cost plus a reasonable --

WITNESS JUNEAU: Which one was that?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: TELRIC, I think. I get them confused. Really, what I'm getting at is why for these services is it appropriate for you to look at value of service as opposed to what it costs you to provide the service?

mean, in one of the interrogatories we responded that it was based on the TSLRIC cost, and I am not a cost expert and don't portray to be, but one significant difference that I'm aware of is that the cost in a TSLRIC or just a common incremental cost study is not complete cost. That is direct cost. It doesn't include any indirect loadings or overheads. It is simply the direct cost of providing the service.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: I just want to know why 1 2 is it appropriate to price these services on the value in the market as opposed to what it cost you plus a

reasonable contribution?

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

WITNESS JUNEAU: Commissioner, I quess I can't get to that answer because I wasn't aware that what we had done was inappropriate. I don't mean to be evasive to you. I know that you have tried to ask me several ways, and I'm not coming back to any different answer and I don't mean to be that way, but I didn't realize we were perceived to be inappropriate in our structure.

COMMISSIONER CLARK: Okay.

(By Mr. Pellegrini) Just a final question, Mr. Juneau. One of Staff's key concerns in this proceeding is whether independent publishers could utilize the information procured under DPDS to avoid the DADS tariff.

A Right.

I'm certain you understand this. Q view, an Internet home page is really nothing more than perhaps a more current version of what's available in a printed directory; and if you accept that, then how would you preserve the distinction between directory assistance and directory

publication?

A The distinction we make is that the directory itself is -- when it is published it's a complete listing at that point in time of every name, address and phone number available, whereas a directory assistance service would be updated continually, and it's subject to individual look-up in the absence of that directory or the choice of not using the directory.

Q So the difference really amounts to one of currency?

A Currency and the use you choose to make of it. It is a convenience. It's -- you know, you may not want to go look for your directory for the cost of a DA call. It is a choice, and certainly someone who makes a DA call has either made that choice because they don't have the directory or they just don't want to go get it.

There obviously is a value in their mind that that DA call then is worth not walking upstairs to get the directory or not looking through the house or some other reason. It's just more convenient. So therein lies the value to the customer, and on that basis then we have perceived that it has a value to BellSouth and any other directory assistance provider.

MR. PELLEGRINI: Thank you, Mr. Juneau. We have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Commissioners? (No response.)

I have one question on your rebuttal, Page

7. You stated that Mr. Screven -- or the question

was, "Mr. Screven indicates that customer address

information associated with unpublished numbers should

be provided with the weekly business activity report.

Is that appropriate."

And I believe your main if not your only rationale was that it's not appropriate because it would compromise the service that BellSouth offers to customers who pay to have their numbers omitted from directories.

WITNESS JUNEAU: Yes, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: I had some concerns with that particular issue. I understand your general proposition here, but there are several services that BellSouth now offers that may compromise that particular service, are there not? The caller ID box; if you're an unlisted customer and you call someone, will not your number and name show up?

WITNESS JUNEAU: I don't know, Chairman. I don't know the answer to that question. I did not

think so, but I certainly am not sure. 2 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Could you give me a late-filed just to answer that question, and say that 3 just in the context of this proceeding? Because someone had called me and that was one of their 5 6 customer complaints, that they had an unlisted number 7 but it shows up if someone has a caller ID box. for purposes of this question and the way that you 8 9 answered it, could you provide me with a late-filed 10 response and the question that I'd like for you to be able to respond to is if someone has an unlisted 11 number and they call someone with one of those caller 12 ID boxes, will their name and number appear in that 13 particular box, and is that not a service that 14 BellSouth offers. 15 WITNESS JUNEAU: Yes, Commissioner, we'll 16 add that to our late-filed exhibits. 17 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And I'll mark that as 18 Late-filed 9 and I'll name it Caller ID Question. 19 20 WITNESS JUNEAU: Certainly. 21 (Late-Filed Exhibit 9 identified.) 22 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Redirect? 23 MR. CARVER: No redirect. 24 CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Exhibits? Exhibit 4, I

25

believe --

ļ	
1	MR. PELLEGRINI: Staff would offer Exhibits
2	4, 5, and 6.
3	CHAIRMAN CLARK: Show those admitted without
4	objection.
5	(Exhibits 4, 5, 6 received in evidence.)
6	WITNESS JUNEAU: Let me just clarify. Those
7	are the three that are MLJ-1, 2, and 3?
8	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Yes.
9	WITNESS JUNEAU: That's correct.
10	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: We have Late-filed
11	Exhibits, 2, 7, 8 and 9.
12	MR. PELLEGRINI: That's correct, Chairman.
13	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Do we have any
14	information as to how much time it would take to
15	supply these or how much time should we give the
16	parties to supply the information we requested?
17	MR. PELLEGRINI: What's a reasonable time?
18	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: The witness appears to
19	have some response to BellSouth's late-filed.
20	WITNESS JUNEAU: Would it be appropriate for
21	me to ask the person that might be preparing the
22	late-filed exhibits what an appropriate time would be?
23	I'm not sure if I said a week or a month, which one
24	would be more appropriate?
25	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Staff, how would you
}	}

1	suggest we proceed?
2	MR. PELLEGRINI: Why don't we set the
3	deadline for two weeks from today, and if that proves
4	to be difficult, we can work something out.
5	WITNESS JUNEAU: Okay. That will be
6	acceptable.
7	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Then we will set the
8	deadline for the late fileds for two weeks from
9	today's date. To the extent that there's a problem,
LΟ	you can let the Commission know; and that relates to
11	both to all four late-filed exhibits.
L2	WITNESS JUNEAU: That's agreeable.
13	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Are there any other
14	matters?
L5	MR. PELLEGRINI: None that I'm aware of,
L6	Chairman Johnson.
L7	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Mr. Juneau
18	MR. PELLEGRINI: Excuse me. I might mention
19	that briefs are due
20	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: You can be excused,
21	Mr. Juneau.
22	(Witness Juneau excused.)
23	
24	MR. PELLEGRINI: February 14th.
25	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: And the briefing

ı	1
1	schedule?
2	MR. PELLEGRINI: February 14th.
3	CHAIRMAN JOHNSON: Any further questions?
4	(No response.) Seeing none, this hearing is
5	adjourned. Thank you very much.
6	(Thereupon, the hearing concluded at
7	1:25 p.m.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
j	

STATE OF FLORIDA) CERTIFICATE OF REPORTERS COUNTY OF LEON 3 We, JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR, Chief, Bureau of Reporting and RUTHE POTAMI, CSR, RPR, Official 4 Commission Reporters, 5 DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the Hearing in Docket No. 931138 was heard by the Florida Public Service Commission at the time and place herein stated; it is 6 further 7 CERTIFIED that we stenographically reported the said proceedings; that the same has been 8 transcribed under our direct supervision; and that this transcript, consisting of 197 pages, constitutes a true transcription of our notes of said proceedings and the insertion of the prescribed prefiled 10 testimony of the witness. 11 DATED this 17th day of January , 1997. 12 13 14 JOY KELLY, CSR, RPR Chief, Bureau of Reporting 15 (904) 413-6732 16 17 18 H. RUPHE POTAMI, CSR, 19 Official Commission Reporter (904) 413-6732 20 21 22 23

24

25